Dear George, Lardner 6/21/79

I'd not finished going over the morning mail when I wrote the note on the enclosed Fort Worth ~~xx~~ ignoring of the mandatory kill on your story on the CIA guy pilfering HSCA. (Did you ask why a contract employee for that assignment?) Then was I surprised to see what has probably been routed to you, Jack Wasserman's letter. Surprised because I'd have thought he'd have spoken to me and asked me first. I did not write him for that purpose. But I really have no objection. You've heard me say it before and you've even accused me of defending the FBI. I'm against all disinformations. And when I can try to refute them.

Wasserman sent the same letter to Anderson, the Times and the two N.O. papers. He sent me copies, which is how I know. I suppose Anderson will not like it.

This really is an aspect of why I write before you are in. Not for you to do a story now because in an effort to find means of continuing to pay a student for part-time help I've given a lead to the Enquirer, which will pay if they use it.

I am now satisfied that I have a prima facie case of this being part of a planned FBI disinformation that began with a leak by our First Unelected (aka ~~xxxx~~ Toad) and ended in its initial ~~xxx~~ stages with a con job on LBJ, which is really what sold him on the belief there was CIA involvement in a conspiracy to kill JFK.

There is a much better source on LBJ's belief than what ~~xx~~ Jenna said LBJ told him, which is what I've sent the Enquirer.

It began with Anderson, and I have that also. In fairness, it is not what Anderson had in mind at all when he spoke to the White House, which sent him ~~xx~~ elsewhere.

The FBI was out to get even with the CIA for what Toad alleged McCone had told the Commission. What indignation! So great the FBI didn't overlook any of its clichés in berating McCone and the CIA, beginning with the triedest and truest nefarious and underhanded.

The odd thing is that nothing attributed to Toad's attribution to McCone reflects in any way on the FBI, meaning they heard something they didn't put on paper or were using the things as an excuse with JFK to get his OK.

For the Enquirer I had to keep it very simple and I omitted all but setting up the CIA by the FBI.

If they don't go for it I won't be trying to make a sale elsewhere because I don't have the time. I deal with them from time to time because I have good friends there who are first-rate reporters and I don't write anything - they do their own story. They have also used me a a consultant, they pay well and it enables me to kill crazy stuff. (I owe them my excellent recent tools my condition requires and I otherwise could not have afforded, a first-rate snow blower, the best light-weight, motor driven weed and brush cutter on the market and a great chipper-mulcher, which has made me the virtual mulch king of suburban Shookstown, if you need any mulch. There is more than enough left for the blade I've engaged for my garden tractor for winter slush, which the blower won't handle. And this without my writing a word and probably less than two days of time over a period of a week. Wild!)

So, if they do not use this are you interested? I'm asking you first because they can take time to reach a decision and if you are not interested I'll offer to the first I speak to.

I have a hunch Golz and the Dallas Morning News may go for Sunday with what he is working on, the FBI's certain knowledge that Oswald had an associate or associates in his New Orleans capers and the memory-holing of the photographs of that person. I've sent him much more than he'll use. He's been waiting for still from a movie I put him onto, amateur film which is not duplicated in this day of Super-8. There is no question of fact and I've been trying to get it from the FBI for more than a decade. Have some.